



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,157	04/22/2004	Hiroshi Ohya	04202.0140-01	5735
22852	7590 11/03/2005	EXAMINER		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			BOCHNA, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/829,157	OHYA, HIROSHI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. Bochna	3679
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time in the second of the s	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).
Status		
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 / 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 25-31 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 25-31 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the correctio	awn from consideration.  for election requirement.  her.  ccepted or b) □ objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ol	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer  2. Certified copies of the priority documer  3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri  application from the International Bures  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [  5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/829,157 Page 2

Art Unit: 3679

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson.

In regard to claim 25, Richardson discloses a sleeve-type pipe joint comprising a joint body 14 having a cylindrical projection 17 adapted to be inserted into a pipe 11 to be connected; and a shrinkable member 23 mounted onto an outer surface of said pipe; said shrinkable member comprising a resiliently deformable sleeve portion 26 having a tapered portion on an outer surface, and a high-rigidity ring portion 24 integrally connected to said sleeve portion via a thin portion 41; the relative movement of said sleeve portion and said ring portion toward each other causing said ring portion 24 to get seated on said sleeve portion with said thin portion cut, whereby said sleeve portion is deformed inward (via 21), resulting in the tight connection of the inner surface of said pipe to the outer surface of said cylindrical projection.

In regard to claim 26, wherein said shrinkable member 26 has at least one portion engageable with said joint body 22.

In regard to claim 27, wherein said sleeve portion has a flange portion 26.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/829,157 Page 3

Art Unit: 3679

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson in view of Woodling.

Richardson discloses a sleeve portion that is designed to contract, but does not specifically disclose that the sleeve portion has a longitudinal slit. Woodling teaches providing a contractible sleeve 34 with a longitudinal slit 38, 39 in order to improve the contracting properties of the sleeve. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sleeve 26 of Richardson to include a longitudinal slit, as taught by Woodling, in order to improve upon the contracting characteristics of the sleeve portion.

5. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Schwarz and Woodling.

In regard to claim 31, Lyon discloses a sleeve-type pipe joint comprising a joint body 10 having a cylindrical projection 26 adapted to be inserted into a pipe 12 to be connected; and a shrinkable member 18 mounted onto an outer surface of said pipe; said shrinkable member comprising a high-rigidity ring portion 16, at least one portion engageable with said joint body 36, which integrally extends from a front end of said ring portion, and a resiliently deformable sleeve portion 18; said sleeve portion comprising a shrinkable portion 50 having a tapered outer surface 48 and a flange portion 46 in this order from the side of said joint body; the sliding movement of said sleeve portion 18 toward said joint body causing said sleeve portion to enter into a space 60 between said ring portion and said pipe with said thin portion cut, whereby said

· Art Unit: 3679

sleeve portion 50 is deformed inward, resulting in the tight connection of the inner surface of said pipe to the outer surface of said cylindrical projection. Lyon discloses a pipe connection that is designed for easy assembly and connection but does not disclose that the ring portion and sleeve portion are one integral member. Schwarz teaches supplying one integral ring and sleeve portion to reduce the number of assembly parts, thereby making a pipe connection that is easier to assemble. Therefore it would have been obvious to make the sleeve and ring member of Lyon integral, in order to make the assembly easier. Also, it would have been obvious to make the two pieces of Lyon one because one-piece construction, in place of separate elements fastened together, is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Kohno, 391 F.2d 959, 157 USPQ 275 (CCPA 1968); In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965).

In regard to the longitudinal slit, Lyon discloses a sleeve portion 18 that is designed to contract, but does not specifically disclose that the sleeve portion has a longitudinal slit. Woodling teaches providing a contractible sleeve 34 with a longitudinal slit 38, 39 in order to improve the contracting properties of the sleeve. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sleeve 18 of Lyon to include a longitudinal slit, as taught by Woodling, in order to improve upon the contracting characteristics of the sleeve portion.

#### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Bochna whose telephone number is (571) 272-7078. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 3679

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on (571) 272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. Bochna Primary Examiner Art Unit 3679